

STAT .

Approved For Release 2003/08/05 : CIA-RDP60-00594A000200020005-8

*DTR Penetration
Aug 3 1-4*

OPENING REMARKS BY DTR AT OTR CORRESPONDENCE SEMINAR - 25 February 1957

I know that you realize that the subject matter of this seminar will be very ably handled by the persons in charge, because I do not know what to tell you to do in this respect, but I thought I would say just a few words on what the peripheral activities the people under you are responsible for, or perhaps the philosophy behind the responsibilities you have. As I look around this particular group and see the seniority and the ability of handling your jobs, I think it would have been more suitable to have kept these words for those who follow, but maybe you can pass this on to them. I think you will remember, those of you who were present at the Christmas Party two years ago, that I said it was a very good change when the then Deputy Director of Administration became the Deputy Director (Support), and I thought it quite appropriate that the Office of Training be included under those offices. I meant that because, whether you like it or not, you are in an office which is supporting the operational offices and the substantive offices of the Agency. That is our reason for being. We are attempting to serve the needs of the other offices of the Agency and once you accept that, I think you must reach the ^{CONCEPTION} . . . of service. Now there may be some of you who are not constitutionally devised to be good servants and if that is true, and you feel it is demeaning to be a servant in a support capacity, then you should take the steps that are necessary either to find yourself another job or - PERIOD! But, as long as you are in a support capacity as I am, and in the

Approved For Release 2003/08/05 : CIA-RDP60-00594A000200020005-8

business of serving the CIA public and outside the Agency, I think you should serve with courtesy. Now, perhaps none of you here need such advice. There are, unfortunately, some in OTR who do, and I will speak of two or three little things in this connection. Most of them have to do with just common courtesy. Common courtesy is a question of how you were brought up or what you have assimilated since. If you look upon courtesy as subservience then I think you must understand the meaning of the word because I feel that I am a servant and, in the business of serving, must be courteous to all people that I serve, and I serve a great many who are your grades and lower.

The first matter of courtesy which I will mention is the tone that you give to the Agency and particularly those outside the Agency whom you prepare correspondence for. We have a unique position in the Office of Training; a great deal of correspondence goes out of this Office in the name of CIA. If a letter goes out that is sloppy, either from a point of view of diction or actual typing, it is a discourtesy to the person who receives that letter. The minute that letter leaves, what it said becomes the property of the receiver. I am sure you have all received letters that have been carelessly written and have formed an opinion of the person who signed the letter, and if that letter was signed off on by the Director of Training or the Director of Central Intelligence, the opinion is formed that the signer of the letter is careless, or the agency from which it came is a careless outfit. More important than correspondence is the question of telephone courtesy. All of us have at some time or another called another office, either in this Agency or outside the Agency,

another government agency, or some industrial outfit, and don't you agree with me that the impression you get over the telephone tends to bias you either in favor of or against the agency which is represented by the person who answered the telephone. I do not think any of us means to be rude over the telephone, and I know that because I speak very feelingly because I have been accused of being rude over the telephone, or brusque to the point of being rude. I do not mean to be and some of you who have answered me over the phone may think I mean to be rude, but I like to say what I have to say and get off the phone. But it is the impression that I leave and the impression that you leave when you answer the phone -- to give an unfortunate example, and it is not directed at the Office of Training but has been told to me -- when DD/S has called for information, they say, "Is Mr. So and So there?" The answer will be, "No." "Do you know when he will be in?" "No." Not "no, sir," "no, mam," but "No." The impression given is about OTR, not who you are, but that the Office of Training is a discourteous, uncooperative office who shouldn't be in the business of supporting people. (Mr. B. then gave correct way of handling call.)

Those are the only things I would like to try to get across to you -- setting the tone in the manner in which you prepare correspondence which goes out, and the manner in which you answer the telephone. And it all comes down to a question of courtesy and your ability to translate your particular job and assignment to that of service. I will mention one other thing: promptness! This meeting was scheduled at 1:15. We started 5 minutes later. This Agency, the American public in general, loses hours and hours of time because people aren't prompt. Do me this

favor - when you know that your boss has an appointment with me for 1:15, if three minutes before 1:15 he looks like he has forgotten, jog him, and be sure that he gets to my office promptly.

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

INTRODUCTION TO TRAINING -- MATTHEW BAIRD

... a fraternization program by our own intelligence service throughout the embassies and missions of the world. When the Russian members of the Soviet Intelligence Service started to go to mission and embassy cocktail parties in the various capitals and places in the world where they are stationed, they caught our boys somewhat with their pants down. Reports came back indicating surprise on the part of our representatives at how good the Soviet Intelligence Officers were throughout the world. What Gordon Stewart was referring to when he raised this point the other day in the Clandestine Services Review Course, was the expertise of members of the Russian Intelligence Service in area and language knowledge. We had more or less looked upon the Russians, whom we hadn't seen socially, as "flat-feet", boorish, perhaps good at surveillance, perhaps good at tradecraft, but we did not expect them to be area experts and excellent linguists in the host country languages and in the language of diplomacy. I don't know why we were surprised at that. We shouldn't have been. I'd like to outline briefly the training program for Russian "diplomats". It is a four year program roughly divided into three main parts. One is on the tradecraft and the intelligence techniques of an Intelligence Officer. That takes roughly 50% of the time. In other words, you're trained in your business, the techniques of your business, in a training course taking approximately two years. The other 50% of the time expended in a four year program is divided in two again and is composed of language and area studies. When I say area studies, I'm talking about

25X1

062

SECRET

the variety of things that make one an intelligent visitor to a foreign country. These could run from anthropology down through sociology. One knows the country which he's in - knows it thoroughly and is able to converse, write and read in that language. He is able to convince the citizens of the host countries that he's courteous enough to find out what makes them tick. The other 25% of the course is devoted to two languages. One of the languages must be English. This has been the trend for the last five years. Each Russian Intelligence Officer must be fluent in English. He must also be fluent in the language of the host countries.

Now, what does all that mean to us? First of all, it shows planning. It would mean to us that for the twenty Junior Officer Trainees in this audience we would start now in their training course to prepare them for their first assignment. Assuming an assignment in Teheran, we would begin preparing them now in the area and language knowledge of that country. In addition, we would make sure that they were fluent in Russian. Now I speak of that because I've never quite understood, in the six years I've been the Director of Training, why we feel that, if we are competing with the Russian Intelligence Service for the minds of men, we can neglect our formal training. That it has been neglected is evident from the presence in this room of some of you who should have had this course six and eight years ago and who have not had, in those six or eight years, a formal training course. Our Defense Department doesn't neglect its formal training. I think the Foreign Service is now picking up in its training. USIA is talking about its training and we can no longer say that we are a young organization and haven't the time to prepare ourselves adequately for our assignments.

SECRET

SECRET

What does all this mean to you in this room? You are a very discrete group. I'm happy to say that roughly 104 of you are less than forty years of age and that 60 of you are less than thirty. Certainly, for the 60 of you who are less than thirty there is something that you can do to prepare yourselves adequately for the job on which you are embarking. I would like to suggest to you under thirty that you will meet increasing competition in this Agency. Mr. Dulles has placed a ceiling on the number of people in the Agency. It was thought over the past year that the talk of ceiling positions would come and go and that the ceiling would be broken three, four, six months after it had been imposed. That has not been true. In addition to the imposition of the ceiling, the demands placed on the Central Intelligence Agency by the National Security Council increased and probably will continue to increase. What happens in such a circumstance? The people charged with meeting these responsibilities have got to be better at their jobs. People who are not good enough to do the jobs and the jobs will now become more and more demanding - are going to drop by the wayside and those who are qualified are the ones who are going to go ahead. I don't think that you will find this an "old line" government organization in that respect. Competition for promotions, which has never been in effect in CIA, is right around the corner and I think promotions will go to those who are best qualified. For those of you under thirty, how do you place yourself in a competitive position? I would suggest that you look at the map and the newspapers and come to your own conclusions about where the battles are going to be fought five years hence. I've said this now for two or three years and I used to use the continent of

25X1

SECRET

25X1

You who are under thirty might, in the next two or three years, use your spare time to make yourself a semi-expert in that territory of the world. You can write your own ticket for promotion and advancement in this Agency because you will be one of a handful of people in this whole United States Government who know that area. For you who are over forty, you've got a battle that's coming soon. That's the continent of India and who knows anything about India? You could qualify in CIA as an expert on India, linguistically or area-wise. Most of you, I'm glad to say, are beginning and I haven't much to say to those of you of my age in the audience, I think we are getting old and I don't think we can do a great deal to prepare ourselves for increasingly responsible positions. However, there are some of you who are young enough and I commend this first course to you as only the first course. It's the beginning for those of you who are under thirty and under forty - the beginning, I hope, of an extensive and well planned training program that will give you increased confidence and better qualify you for positions of increased importance in the Central Intelligence Agency.